

REMARKS

Claims 1-21, 23, and 25 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 15, and 16 have been amended. The claim amendments are supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST

If after considering the claim amendments and remarks set forth herein the Examiner believes that the application is not in a condition for allowance, Applicants request an interview with the Examiner ***prior to issuance of another Office Action***. Applicants are thus filing an Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form herewith. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative, Brent G. Seitz, at 248-641-1262 to schedule the interview.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 15, 21, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori (JP 2001075950) in view of Hamaguchi (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0222984), and in further view of Chang et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0078057). Claims 16-20 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori in view of Hamaguchi, Iwabuchi et al. (JP 04-094955), and Chang et al. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori and Hamaguchi in view of Chang and Wang (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0243826). Claim 11

stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori and Hamaguchi, Chang, and Tyler et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,638,498). Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori, Hamaguchi, Chang, Wang, and Tyler. Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori and Hamaguchi, in view of Chang, and Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori, Hamaguchi, Chang as modified with Wang, Tyler, and AAPA. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended independent Claims 1, 15, and 16 each recite, in part and with reference to Figure 5 for example, a print-image displaying section 40 includes “a selector switch [44] configured to connect **any one** of the plurality of first driving circuits [43] to the band-data storing part [45]” (emphasis added). The Office Action acknowledged that Mori, Hamaguchi, and Iwabuchi each fail to disclose the claimed selector switch, as well as various other claim features. With respect to the claimed selector switch, the Office Action relied **solely** on the newly cited Chang reference.

Chang appears to disclose, with reference to Figures 1-3 and 5, a display device including a panel unit 300. A gate driver 400 including a plurality of stages SRC (Figure 5) drives gate lines G and a data driver 500 drives data lines D. Figure 2 illustrates one pixel of the display. Each pixel includes a pixel electrode 190, an individual pixel switching element Q, and a storage capacitor Cst, **which does not store band data**. The Office Action appears to assert that the stages SRC disclose the claimed “plurality of first driving circuits,” the data driver 500 discloses the claimed “second driving circuit,”

and the switch Q discloses the claimed “selector switch” because it allegedly “provides connection between SRC and storing capacitor C_{ST}” (see Office Action at pp. 5, 8, 12).

But Chang provides a separate switch Q for **each pixel**, and thus following the Examiner’s logic each switch Q can only select a **single** SRC. Further, storage capacitor C_{ST} does not store band-data, as the claimed “band-data storing part” does. Rather, “the storage capacitor C_{ST} is an auxiliary capacitor for the LC capacitor C_{LC} [which includes pixel electrode 190, common electrode 270, and LC layer 3 therebetween] and it may be omitted if unnecessary.” See ¶¶ [0050, 0051]. Chang thus fails to disclose or suggest “a selector switch configured to connect **any one of** the plurality of first driving circuits to the **band-data** storing part,” as set forth in amended independent Claims 1, 15, and 16.

Because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of amended independent Claims 1, 15, and 16, combination of the references fails to render these claims obvious. Applicants thus respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of independent Claims 1, 15, and 16, as well as those claims dependent therefrom.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 14, 2011

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, PLC.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/BGS

15996743.1